REMARKS

Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy of the telephonic interview on May 24, 2005, in which the claim amendments made above were discussed.

Claim Status

Claims 1–17 were originally presented for examination. Claims 4, 7, 10, 13 and 17 where subsequently cancelled, leaving claims 1–3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 14–16 for examination. In the Office action mailed on December 3, 2003, the claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,447,565 to Daswani et al. ("*Daswani*"), U.S. Patent No. 6,141,005 to Hetherington et al. ("*Hetherington*"), and U.S. Patent No. 6,466,203 to Van Ee ("*Van Ee*"). Applicants filed an Amendment and Response on March 3, 2004. A second Office Action was mailed on September 23, 2004 in which the claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,590,588 to Lincke et al. ("*Lincke*") in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,781,720 to Parker et al. ("*Parker*"). Applicants filed an Amendment and Response on January 11, 2005. A Final Office Action was mailed on April 6, 2005 maintaining the rejections stated in the September 23, 2004 Office Action.

An interview was held on May 25, 2005 between Applicants' Attorneys and the Examiner to discuss the pending rejections. Applicants submit this Amendment and Response in which claims 1, 5, 8 and 14 have been amended, with claim 5 having been amended and rewritten in independent form. Support for the amendments can be found at least at page 15 line 18 and page 17 line 6 of the specification. No new matter has been added.

The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in light of the amendments above and discussion below.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Independent Claims 1, 8 and 14

Independent claims 1 and 8, as amended, each recite, in part:

> "an interactive graphical human-machine interface when operating on the handheld portable computing device to allow control of at least one parameter of a process external

> to the handheld portable computing device by use of the handheld portable computing device" (emphasis added)

Independent Claim 14, as amended, recites, in part:

> "exchanging information between the computer and the handheld portable computing device, to control at least one parameter of the process, the process being external to the handheld portable computing device" (emphasis added)

Lincke describes systems and methods for providing sensory information regarding data to be sent to a communications device prior to sending the data in order to properly set the user's expectations with regard thereto. (Column 3 line 61.) One aspect of the system described by *Lincke* is the ability of a host computer to generate software objects using a "Compact Markup Language" (CML) that pre-formats data according to the screen size and depth of a device having limited screen capabilities. (Column 22 line 4.) The process of rendering the data on the handheld device is subsequently affected by the CML commands and formatting options in the software object sent to the handheld device. As a result, the capabilities described by *Lincke* merely facilitate reformatting of presentation data so that it will fit on a smaller screen and be actionable on a device having fewer functional capabilities that the host computer that generated the data. Thus, the "process" being controlled by the software object (the CML command) is a process residing on the handheld device itself (rendering data on the screen).

Parker describes methods for automated testing software applications having graphical user interfaces ("GUIs") by generating inputs to the GUIs that simulate user events such as keyboard strokes or mouse actions. (Column 4 line 1.)

In contrast, claims 1, 8 and 14 as amended recite the generation of software objects that are transferred to a handheld device and used on the handheld device to affect processes that are ***external*** thereto. Such capabilities allow, for example, a user to monitor and manipulate parameters of complex manufacturing processes with a lightweight, handheld device running software objects that have bee designed, built, and tested using more powerful computers. As a result, the hand-held device can be used on the factory floor, eliminating the need to connect each piece of machinery to the larger, more powerful computers.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that both *Lincke* and *Parker*, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every limitation of independent claims 1, 8 and 14 as amended, and respectfully submit that the rejections over *Lincke* and *Parker* should be withdrawn and these claims, as well as those claims that depend directly or indirectly therefrom, allowed.

Independent Claim 5

Independent claim 5, as amended, recites, in part:

> "generating on the computer an interactive control software object that provides an interactive graphical human-machine interface when operating on the handheld portable computing device to allow control of at least one parameter of a process by use of the handheld portable computing device, the interactive control software object being processor-independent and the computer further comprising a run-time engine specific to a selected processor present on the handheld portable computing device" (emphasis added).

Lincke describes using "either a standard browser engine or a thin browser engine" as the user interface for the wireless device receiving data from the host. (Column 13 line 30.) In contrast, Applicants' claimed invention facilitates the use, for example, of multiple run-time engines ***on the computer*** that are specific to a particular processor on the hand-held device. By matching the run-time engine on the computer generating the software objects to that of the hand-held device on which the objects will actually run, it is possible, for example, to execute a comprehensive, environment-specific test suite that will minimize unexpected errors due to operating system discrepancies.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that both *Lincke* and *Parker*, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of independent claim 5 as amended, and respectfully submit that the rejections over *Lincke* and *Parker* should be withdrawn and this claim, as well as those claims that depend directly or indirectly therefrom, allowed.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Applicants request reconsideration, withdrawal of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of all of the pending claims in due course.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation with the Applicants' attorney would be helpful in expediting the allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 6, 2005

Joel E. Lehrer (Reg. No. 56,401)
Attorney for Applicants
Goodwin | Procter LLP
Exchange Place
53 State Street
Boston, MA 02109

Tel. No.: (617) 570-1057
Fax No.: (617) 523-1231